

Arizona Military Regional Compatibility Project Western Maricopa County / Luke Air Force Base

Political Jurisdictions / Agency Staff Interest Group Meeting December 17, 2002 8:30 am

- Introductions
 - We ask that all comments are received no later than January 27th
- Chapter 1, 2, and 3
 - Page 1-1, Section 1.2 Project Goals: bullet 3 – why did we go from 65 to 60 dnl contours?
 - Strategies that have been recommended to not go forward – all recommendations will be looked at further.
 - Even if Luke were to go, the facility would remain a potential air facility with the noise issue remaining – need to be proactive in establishing the types of land uses in the area of Luke that are compatible with air craft facilities.
 - Believes that the argument is positioned with Luke/noise versus land use/development.
 - There are alternatives for the West side and we should be looking into the future to decide the fate of the West Valley.
 - Cost-benefit analysis to look at Luke's dollars compared to land use/development dollars is needed.
 - Project Goals 1.2: need to quantify the danger/risk of each of the bullet points.
 - Need to understand the risk of an air force base near residential development – document that the risk is present (quantify)
 - Premise to preserve Luke; however, there are variables that could change – what is the guarantee?
 - Do we have a position from Luke AFB on the Plan? – Not yet, at the interest group meeting on Dec 18th
 - Concerned that the 65 dnl contour is like a “wall” between “good and evil” – where is the start to a “viable living environment?”
 - Suggestion that we chart the contour lines for the 60, 65, and 50 dnl locations, would like to see these contours also managed for land use development.
 - What is the implementation of this Plan? Procedures, steps? Answer: this plan does not “require” jurisdictions to “adopt” this plan; however, the support of the jurisdictions is important with the “adoption” of the Plan by jurisdictional resolutions. This would create consent at the local level and show the Federal

government the jurisdictions are together – although this may not be enough? Partnership is key.

- Project Team: would like to ask the jurisdictions to document the dollars that they have expended with the revisions of general plan/land use documents
- Goodyear: process of updating the General Plan, population projections are out-of-date in the Plan – need to incorporate the “new” numbers
- Goodyear: would like to see some narrative about the “southern departure corridor” – what is the geographic area/extent and provide graphics/maps to show area. Answer: we will provide information in appendices of the Final Plan to explain areas/definitions.
- Will the compatible land uses within LUCA-2 be more focused? Answer: will go out to the 65 dnl noise contours, which is within LUCA-2.
- Page 2-19; 2.4.8: City of Surprise – please note in the Draft Plan that the Surprise Center is NOT within the 65 dnl.
- Noise attenuation standards for construction – in 1996 standards were developed – look to the MAG noise attenuation standards.
- Majority of the noise complaints come from LUCA 2 and 3. Only about 4% in LUCA 1.
- Luke: reductions of noise complaints are due to
 - “good” weather
 - Disclosure within the Box that has mitigated complaints
 - southern departures
- The largest number of complaints come from people who live outside of the Vicinity Box because of increased population and no notification. Would help to have disclosure outside of the Vicinity Box, but within the overflight areas – which would be the area within LUCA-3. Recommendation to have LUCA-3 be a notification area for noise.
- Need to look at the relationship of the density of population to noise complaints (quantify numbers)
- Chapters 4 and 5
 - How is LUCA 1 different from the previously accepted ACUIZ? – description of the area.
 - Clarification – labels are needed on LUCA-1, 2 and 3 to show where they are.
 - Explanation of what’s really in LUCA 1 & 2 compared to the ACUIZ guidelines/land uses.
 - Is there a regulation that requires the base to own the munitions storage? The base does own the storage depot however it is an island and the base should have a contiguous owned path to the storage area.
 - Need to discuss further the Growing Smarter legislations/inconstant densities between the plan recommendations and the legislation.

- What is a viable living environment for people in the noise shadow and what are the appropriate actions to take. Can't prohibit people from living in these areas (mentioned that zoning can prohibit people from living in an area). Lower densities (by choice) would be better – advantages would be the ability to have horses, etc.
- White Tanks/Agua Fria (recently updated by MC – to 1 unit/ac) would give a special kind of coloring (rural, 'horse property') to the development in an area.
- ROUND TABLE
 - WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU MAKE IN THE LAND USE COMPATIBILITY?
 - Require disclosure (Avigation clause in Youngtown).
 - How was Youngtown included in LUCA 2? (GIS calculation – not arbitrary – to pick up 60 contour)
 - Can we get Luke to restrain their flight paths? No.
 - ¾ mile path from 65 dnl is primarily in response to noise concerns, future noisier aircraft engines and for a buffer for the Base.
 - Comparisons of compatible land uses what LUCA 2 does vs. what the GS statute does... if it's simply a matter of expanding it out to the 65 dnl line. Land acquisition is the simplest strategy.
 - Concerns about the recommendations: the 20-acre low-density patchwork, the vicinity area (population less than 10% - political). Confusing concept and language... LUCA 1 is critical to preservation of the mission. Prioritize the strategies and the importance of the LUCAs with the level of safety/noise threat. Concern about the enforcement and plan after the composition is complete. Need a political champion. Need an agency or individual to also champion or look over the implementation.
 - Goodyear: concerned with purchasing the development rights to the southern departure area. Suspension of building activity and joint power authority are not practical. Define the area affected.
 - Page 6-5: # 6.4.1 Introduction of local traffic could impair the mission of the base.
 - Sub-section 6.7.1 could cause conflict with other civilian flight paths.
 - Luke has worked and continues work to accommodate growth (the box has been a preservation success story and is looked to as a model). Operations have been shifted to the south... an explanation of how operations have changed.
 - County: needs more exploration of the document. Needs more clear and consistent responses from Luke about potential development. Appreciates having a good relationship with the base. Recommends prioritization of critical area through funding mechanism.

- Communication guidelines (and criteria) between Luke and jurisdictions. Regional process could remain static with base commander changes. We're waiting on a draft proposal.
- No response from the Base tends to negate the purpose of sharing information. They need to have something to say about every notification.
- Land use decisions should be a local responsibility - unfair to force the base to be the bad guy and state what may be obvious... any new development could threaten operations.
- Information sharing is necessary – at least to the point that jurisdictions to know what is expected of them by the base. Bad when the Base is silent. Becomes a conflict of Fed vs. local powers. Is possibly risky for the Base to give too much feedback. Value of Luke capitalized (9%) makes it a very important investment to preserve. Might be even more valuable than initially anticipated. To generate income of 1.5 billion annually there has to be a “sunk” capital cost of between 9 and 15 billion dollars. If Luke goes away, how much and how long would it take to recapture the 1.5 billion annual income expenditures?
- Is it in the contract to indicate the economic impact of developing Luke if the mission goes away? Perhaps a cost / benefit analysis (stay vs. go).
- (1) In order to put the Plan into motion enabling legislation may be needed (moratorium/impact fees/down-zoning) (2) if local jurisdictions adopt the Plan they will need other authorities to help implement (state departments). What needs to be done from a state level in order to have local jurisdictions be able to implement.
- Would like the moratorium strategy reviewed with the elected officials
- The Plan's strategies have a lot of costs – need to look at the costs associated with each of the strategies so that informed decisions can be made.
- Need to protect the southern departure corridor – what is being done to do this?
- Cost/Benefit analysis is needed to make informed decisions about whether to save Luke or not.
- Be proactive about land use decisions – believes the Plan puts jurisdictions in the reactive position.
- Moratorium and controlled zoning are too extreme.
- Remove LUCA 2 and 3. Supportive of the current noise contour lines, vicinity box regulations; however, could expand the vicinity box for the notification of noise. Concerned about how LUCA 3 came about? – LUCA 3 affects a lot of the planning work that has already taken place.
- Enhanced notification within LUCA 3 is very important.
- Luke would like to clarify the routes they take to the Goldwater Range (up to 3).
- Concerned about limited economic development that could result from the implementation of the Plan's strategies.

- Consider legal defense funds/indemnify local governments against the takings issue – concerned about per se takings.
- 75% of the City of El Mirage is within the 65 dnl.
- If agriculture is going to be looked at as a way to preserve Luke for the long run – look at a way of helping local farmers prosper within the region to be able to compete with other areas - incentives (e.g. increasing availability of reliable work force, water at a decreased cost, concessions)
- Would like to see Luke better share their information and disseminate with the public, jurisdictions, landowners, etc.
- Luke supports the Joint Land Use Study and AICUZ and follows guidelines

RECAP

- Respect the existing GP within the communities.
- Look to funding to buy up LUCA 1 and 2 to protect the Base.
- Moratorium should not be utilized.
- LUCA 2 may be out too far.
- Cost/Benefit analysis needs to be conducted.
- Jurisdictions would like to note that viewpoints might change when elected officials come to the table.
- Get rid of LUCA 3.
- Look for land uses that are complementary to Luke's operations.
- Who is going to carry out the roles and responsibilities?
- Practicality of the Plan may require enabling legislation.
- Define the southern departure corridor.